

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

REBIO RONNIE TOWNSEND,

Plaintiff,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE HOSPITALS,  
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [21-cv-02055-EMC](#)

**ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

On July 23, 2021, mail was sent from the Court to Plaintiff at the address he provided to the Court. Docket No. 15. This mail was returned undelivered on August 23, 2021, bearing a stamp that read in part “return to sender” and had a handwritten notation “UTF,” which is used to indicate that the post office is unable to forward. Docket No. 17-1. Plaintiff has not provided any address other than the address to which the undeliverable mail was sent. More than sixty days have passed since the mail was returned to the Court undelivered.

Plaintiff has failed to comply with Local Rule 3-11(a) which requires a party proceeding *pro se* to “promptly file with the Court and serve upon all opposing parties a Notice of Change of Address specifying the new address” when his address changes. Local Rule 3-11(b) allows the Court to dismiss a complaint without prejudice when mail directed to a *pro se* party is returned as not deliverable and the *pro se* party fails to send written notice of his current address within sixty days of the return of the undelivered mail.

///

///

1 This action is **DISMISSED** without prejudice pursuant to Local Rule 3-11(b), because  
2 Plaintiff failed to keep the Court informed of his address in compliance with Local Rule 3-11(a).

3  
4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5  
6 Dated: November 3, 2021

7  
8 

9 EDWARD M. CHEN  
10 United States District Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28